



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/849,344	05/07/2001	Hiroshi Yokoyama	PW 0277195 TK(F)-060-US	1120
909	7590	02/27/2006	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP P.O. BOX 10500 MCLEAN, VA 22102			HUSON, MONICA ANNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1732	
DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/849,344

Applicant(s)

YOKOYAMA ET AL.

Examiner

Monica A. Huson

Art Unit

1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3 and 5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the Amendment filed 21 November 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the servo delay" in line 19. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bulgrin (U.S. Patent 5,997,778). Regarding Claim 1, Bulgrin shows an injection control method for a die casting machine, wherein molten material is injected into a casting mold by an injection cylinder unit (Abstract), comprising setting target velocity data specifying an injection operation required

Art Unit: 1732

for the injection cylinder unit in advance (Column 11, lines 32-35); performing a first shot of an injection operation, and recording command data provided to the injection cylinder unit and detecting velocity data indicating the operation performed by the injection cylinder unit during the first shot of the injection operation (Column 16, lines 2-35); determining a difference between the detected velocity data and the target velocity data and calculating a correction value based on the difference by operating the injection cylinder unit for a predetermined number of injection shots by injection position feedback control (Column 16, lines 49-59); terminating the injection position control after the predetermined number of injection shots (Column 16, lines 59-61); using the calculated correction value and generating command data for a second shot of the injection operation and operating the injection cylinder unit by providing to it the command data for the second shot of the injection operation while shifting the control to open loop control of the injection velocity by command data generated from the correction value and the previous command data (Column 16, lines 35-38; Column 17, lines 23-27; Column 21, lines 50-55), wherein adjustment of the servo delay is made for each of low velocity, high velocity, and deceleration section of a shot of the injection operation (Column 4, lines 59-65; Column 15, lines 1-10, 60-66; Column 16, lines 2-7, 11-18, 23-25, 64-66; Column 21, lines 19-35, 59-63).

Regarding Claim 3, Bulgrin shows the process as claimed as discussed in the rejection of Claim 1 above, including a method wherein a value of servo delay in the injection cylinder unit is set in advance, and in calculating the correction value, the difference between the detected velocity data and the target velocity data is calculated in a state that the phase of the detected velocity data is advanced by the servo delay (Column 21, lines 19-35; Column 22, lines 24-33).

Regarding Claim 5, Bulgrin shows the process as claimed as discussed in the rejection of Claim 1 above, including a method wherein in setting the target velocity data, a pattern in terms of position and velocity for specifying injection operation is set in advance by a user, the pattern being converted into time-series position command data in terms of position and time so as to be used for injection position feedback control, as well as the pattern being converted into target velocity data in terms of velocity and time (Column 10, lines 2-53).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 21 November 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that Bulgrin does not show adjustment of the servo delay for each of the low velocity, high velocity, and deceleration sections of the injection operation. This is not persuasive because it is maintained that Bulgrin discloses adjusting the control law, and thus, the delay (i.e. lag) of the control law for the entire molding operation (including operation of the servomotors which control operation of the screw) at numerous set points during the operation. Bulgrin suggests that the control law's lag time, i.e. delay, is varied "by taking an average number of closely spaced set points at very fast intervals" (Column 16, lines 23-25). Therefore, it is believed that the since the control law takes into account a given delay at any given time, respectively, during the molding operation, the delay will indeed be adjusted for each of the low velocity, high velocity, and deceleration sections of the molding operation.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monica A. Huson whose telephone number is 571-272-1198. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Colaianni can be reached on 571-272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Monica A Huson
February 21, 2006


MICHAEL P. COLAIANNI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER